

# THE Converted Catholic. EDITED BY FATHER O'CONNOR.

When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.—Luke xxii., 32.

VOL. VII.

NEW YORK, MARCH, 1890.

NO. 3.

## THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC.

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

Specially designed for the enlightenment of Roman Catholics and their conversion to Evangelical Christianity.

JAMES A. O'CONNOR, PUBLISHER,  
72 Bible House, New York.

Subscription. Per Year, \$1.00  
Single Copies, 10 Cents.

The office of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC has been changed to 72 Bible House.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as second-class matter.

### CONTENTS.

### PAGE.

CONVERTS FROM ROME,	68
Another Nun Married,	69
Good Work in Baltimore,	70
Times are Changed,	71
One Defeat for Rome,	72
Ireland and Rome,	73
The American Flag,	75
Three Good Books for \$2.50,	75
The Jesuits in Brazil,	75
Key Notes From Rome—Romanism and the Republic,	76
Methodists Against Romanists,	81
Episcopalians Against Rome,	81
The Church of Christ,	82
Primacy of St. Peter,	83
"Wife, I Have it Now,"	86
Was the Apostle Peter Ever at Rome?	88
Father O'Connor's Letters to Cardinal Gibbons,	92
"Father Flynn,"	95
Miss Cusack's New Book,	95
"The Spiritual Man,"	95
Converted Catholic Tracts,	95
CHRIST'S MISSION,	96
Kind Words,	96

### EDITORIAL NOTES.

IN THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW, IV: 2, we read: "And when Jesus had fasted forty days and forty nights, He afterward hungered." Upon this text the Roman Catholic Church has built its Lenten fast of forty days before Easter. In former times the fast was strictly enforced, but latterly it has been greatly relaxed. Though the Lenten regulations for this year were read in the Roman Catholic churches Sunday, February 16, when the obligations to fast on certain days were inculcated, they have been countermanded, as we learn from the following dispatch to the New York *Herald*:

"MONTREAL, Feb. 19, 1890.—The Lenten regulations issued by Archbishop Fabre for the archdiocese of Montreal, and published in all the churches last Sunday, have been countermanded.

"Last evening the Archbishop received information from Rome to the effect that the Pope has issued a brief in which he grants a general dispensation from the ordinary Lenten regulations to countries affected by influenza. The information reached the Archbishop late last evening, and an order

was immediately sent to all the parish churches for announcement to day to the following effect:

"Wednesdays and Fridays of each week and Saturday of Ember week, as well as Holy Saturday, are days of fasting and abstinence. But in place of the ordinary fast his holiness desires the faithful to apply themselves with more zeal to works of piety, charity towards the poor and frequenting churches and the sacraments. The Lenten regulations this year, therefore, are no more than the ordinary regulations for Advent."

THE ABSURDITY OF THUS COUNTERMANDING the Lenten fast must be apparent even to the Roman Catholics. They expected that some spiritual blessings would come to them from eating fish and eggs rather than meat, but the Pope says no, not this year; you can eat all the meat you want, and it will be all right. He regulates the quantity and quality of the food his followers must consume, and they blindly obey him, because he says the Vatican Council made him infallible. When he orders them through the bishops and priests to vote at elections in a certain way and to carry out a certain line of policy they must obey him also.

OBEEDIENCE TO THE ORDERS OF THE Pope is the first duty of Roman Catholics. He may be influenced by such whims and caprices as led him to countermand the regulations for Lent, yet he is their "holy Father," and as good children they must obey him. Observation leads us to believe, however, that they are not as "good" as they used to be, for, thank God, many

of them are disobeying him by renouncing his authority and leaving his church forever.

AMONG THE MISSIONARIES THAT SAILED for Liberia January 30, 1890, to reinforce Bishop Taylor's missions in Africa, was Miss Mary O'Neil, of Pittsburgh, a convert from the Roman Catholic Church. Miss O'Neil will doubtless do great good in Africa.

EACH OF THE ARTICLES IN THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC on "Peter at Rome" by Rev. Mason Gallagher is worth the price of the magazine for a year. In consulting authorities and using his great stores of learning Dr. Gallagher has not spared himself but freely gives our readers the results of his historical studies.

A REMARKABLE SERIES OF ARTICLES ON the Roman Catholic Church and American Institutions by Dr. C. J. Little, of Syracuse University, has recently appeared in the Northern *Christian Advocate*. Some of our correspondents think he speaks too favorably of the Roman Church. We hope the articles will be published in book form when the subject can be discussed more intelligently.

WHEN WE WERE INVITED TO BALTIMORE last November to hold meetings in various churches we accepted with the well-defined purpose of preaching the Gospel. That purpose we kept steadily in view. Some surprise, mingled perhaps with disappointment, was felt that we did not devote all our time to attacking Popery. But as we were engaged in better business, and many Roman Catholics were converted, we believe subsequent events justified our

course. Sympathetic interest in the conversion of the Roman Catholics has been aroused and the Catholics themselves are ready to hear the Gospel. We have been invited to hold evangelistic meetings again in Baltimore, in the Monument Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of which the Rev. Dr. McKinney is pastor, in April, and we ask the prayers of our readers for their success. As will be seen by the press notices elsewhere in this issue, the meetings in Bethany Methodist Church last month proved a blessing to Pastor Thirlkeld and his congregation.

1870—1890,

TWENTY YEARS AGO WE WERE A STUDENT for the priesthood in St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, and received ordination there. In February, 1890, we brought a student for the priesthood out of that seminary, and he was truly converted to Christ as we talked and prayed together in the study of Rev. L. A. Thirlkeld, the beloved pastor of Bethany Chnrch. A few days later he made public announcement of the great blessing he had received and was admitted to membership in Bethany Methodist Church. He came with us to New York, as he desires to continue his studies—this time for the Gospel ministry, and not for the priesthood of Rome—we shall send him to one of the Protestant seminaries. We bespeak a kind welcome and warm sympathy for our dear young brother, J. W. Holmes.

FATHER McGLYNN HAS BEEN SO SERIOUSLY ill for the last month that he had to give up all his lecture engagements. He is now convalescent and will go South for a season. Later on he will

resume his lectures, when they will be duly reported in THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC.

WE SHALL FILL ORDERS FOR THE Nun of Kenmare's new book, "Life Inside the Church of Rome," price \$1.75, and her "Autobiography," price \$1.50, immediately on receipt of price. To our subscribers we will send both books when ordered at the same time for \$3.00.

REV. GEO. C. NEEDHAM'S SOUL-STIRRING history of "Father Flynn's" experience and conversion that appeared in THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC last year, is published in a handsome volume at the moderate price of 30 cents in paper cover, and 50 cents bound in cloth. We remember the many expressions of interest and pleasure that came to us from our suscribers as they followed "Father Flynn's" career, his adventures and spiritual struggles, in the pages of the magazine each month. The pleasure will be renewed as they read his story again in book form. It is a delightful work to read, and a most useful one to send to Roman Catholic priests and people for whose conversion we are anxious. Twelve copies of the book will be sent for \$3.00 in paper covers, and \$5.00 bound in cloth.

PRESS OF MATTER COMPELS US TO hold over the continuation of the "History of the Jesuits." It will appear next month.

MANY, VERY MANY—OH, SO MANY!—SUBSCRIBERS have not renewed their subscriptions this year, and THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC is compelled to call their attention to the oversight. 'Tis not too late yet!

## CONVERTS FROM ROME.

**T**HE present Secretary of State, James G. Blaine, is not the first convert from Rome that has been a member of the Cabinet. The late Mr. Daniel Manning, Secretary of the Treasury in Mr. Cleveland's Cabinet, was also a convert from the Roman Catholic Church. He became a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church, while Mr. Blaine is a Congregationalist, though he worships in a Presbyterian Church in Washington. Though Mr. Blaine is very friendly to the Roman Catholics and courts the Roman Catholic vote in politics, the rough element in that Church looks upon him as an apostate from the "true Church." When his eldest daughter, the wife of Colonel Coppinger, of the United States Army, died last January she was buried from St. Matthew's Roman Catholic Church, Washington, as she had become a Roman Catholic at the time of her marriage. When the funeral procession entered the church the husband, as a devout Roman Catholic, made a genuflection towards the altar on which reposed the host, but Mr. Blaine as a Protestant did not bow to the wafer. This aroused the wrath of the Roman Catholics in the gallery, and they loudly hissed the Secretary. Cardinal Gibbons, who was present to pronounce the benediction over the remains of Mrs. Coppinger, did not rebuke his unmannerly followers. Doubtless he thought Mr. Blaine deserved the hissing on general principles for abandoning the faith of Rome, and in particular for not acknowledging the power of the priests to transubstantiate the wafer into the

"body and blood, soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ," as the Roman Catholic catechism says.

\*\*

Readers of our metropolitan journals will be interested in the following paragraph which we take from the *New York Mail and Express*, Feb. 15, 1890:

"It may not be generally known that the father of E. L. Godkin, Esq., the editor of our esteemed contemporary, the *New York Evening Post*, was formerly a Roman Catholic who became converted and wrote a book entitled "Guide from the Church of Rome to the Church of Christ," and that formerly he edited the *Daily Express* newspaper of Dublin, Ireland."

\*\*

Another converted Catholic priest, Rev. John C. Hojda, resides in Baltimore. On Sunday, February 3, 1890, he delivered an address on "The Life and Times of John Huss" before the members of the Bohemian beneficial and literary societies of Baltimore who are raising funds for the erection of a monument to John Huss, the converted Roman Catholic priest and Reformer of Prague, who was burned at the stake by order of the Council of Constance and the Pope in 1415. Mr. Hojda is engaged in business in Baltimore and is greatly respected in business and literary circles.

\*\*

Mr. J. W. Holmes, the Roman Catholic student of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, who was converted during the evangelistic services conducted by the Editor of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC in Bethany Methodist Church, Baltimore, last month, is

a very intelligent young man, far above the average Roman Catholic student for the priesthood. A full account of his conversion, with his dignified, pathetic and spiritual letter of withdrawal from the seminary and from the Roman Catholic Church, addressed to the president of the seminary and one of the professors, will be found in the "Letter to Cardinal Gibbons." His appearance in Bethany Church the last two nights of the evangelistic services created a sensation, as the reporter of the Baltimore *American* said; but it was a sensation of a most healthy spiritual kind, which demonstrated that the Gospel of the grace of God can save now as in former times.

The *English Churchman*, February 6, 1890, says: "The Rev. Geo H. Clare, priest of the Roman Catholic diocese of Leeds, has seceded from the Roman Catholic Church to join the Unitarian body."

\* \* \*

December 14, 1889.

DEAR SIR:

I have read your magazine for over a year, and as I am a converted Catholic myself, I take a great deal of interest in it and in all your work. I can now read my Bible, the blessed book, that the poor Roman Catholics are not privileged to read, and oh, what joyous comfort it brings me! May the dear Lord bless you and your work.

MRS. J. W.

\* \* \*

January 7th, 1890.

DEAR SIR:

You will please continue to send THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC to my old address. My husband, although a Roman Catholic, is very much pleased with it.

MRS. M. McG.

### Another Nun Married.

A dispatch from San Francisco, February 3, tells of the elopement and marriage of a nun in that city. It is a romantic story, like the marriage of every nun. But there are some special features of unusual interest in this case. The dispatch says:

"Sister Margaret Mary was the name which Cora La Thanune assumed two years ago, when she took the black veil and became a teacher in Notre Dame College, which is opposite the old mission Dolores Church in the suburbs. Her father is a French florist, and she has two sisters, one married.

"The unmarried sister, Bertha, was recently engaged to Charles Perkins, an iron moulder. Bertha and her husband paid several visits to Cora, and young Perkins seemed greatly struck with the nun. Bertha noticed his infatuation and they quarrelled on the day the three went together to inspect the new house which Perkins was furnishing for his intended bride. Bertha's jealousy flamed out and she asked him to decide between them. He chose the nun and the younger sister acquiesced.

"One stormy night two weeks ago the convent sisters found that Margaret Mary had disappeared. They could get no clue to her, but last night she was found in the new cottage with her husband, Charles Perkins. They were married, and after a brief honeymoon returned to the house that had been furnished for the younger sister. Bertha does not seem to mind her failure to get married. She says it was better to give her lover up than to make two people wretched." Good luck to the young couple.

## GOOD WORK IN BALTIMORE.

[From the Baltimore "Methodist," Feb. 13.]

**B**EETHANY Methodist Church has been favored for two weeks with a gracious revival influence, the blessed results of which have extended far beyond the people of the congregation and even beyond Protestant circles. Rev. James A. O'Connor, Editor of **THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC**, has been a prominent figure in the meetings. Every evening he has addressed a large congregation, including many Roman Catholics. During the day several Catholics have called at the parsonage to have private conversation and inquire the way of salvation. Notable among these has been a student of theology in a Roman Catholic institution of this city. On Thursday of last week he knelt with Brother O'Connor in Pastor Thirlkeld's study, and in a few minutes found peace in Christ. On Sunday evening last nearly a thousand persons came to the service.

\*\*\*

The Baltimore correspondent of the New York *Christian Advocate* says in the issue of the *Advocate*, Feb. 20, 1890:

"The Rev. James A. O'Connor, Editor of **THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC**, has been assisting Brother Thirlkeld, pastor of Bethany Church, in revival services. These meetings have been in progress for about two weeks, and have been blessed to the good of many. Among those professing faith in Christ have been several members of the Roman Catholic Church, and, notable among these, a young man, a student of theology in one of the institutions in this city. This phase of Protestant evangelistic effort has been prominent in Baltimore during the last months. The

Baptist ministers, especially the Rev. A. C. Dixon, of Immanuel Baptist Church, have taken the lead in this, inviting to their pulpits such speakers as Fathers O'Connor and Chiniquy and the Nun of Kenmare. There has been no attempt to arouse passion upon the subject, but rather to show just what Rome teaches and how, notwithstanding the pretended liberality of some of her teachers, she as certainly denies to men now the rights of individual conscience as ever she did in the Middle Ages, and is as intolerant of opposition now as then.

### Wholesale Excommunication.

Sunday, February 16, 1890, Monsignor Doane who lately received the title of Prothonotary Apostolic from the Pope, informed the parishioners of St. Patrick's Cathedral in Newark, N. J., that they must take their children from the public schools and send them to the parochial schools, under penalty of excommunication and denial of absolution in case they fail to do so. A similar announcement was made by order of Bishop Wigger in all the Roman Catholic churches in the diocese of Newark. It is to be hoped the threat of excommunication will be carried out. Father McGlynn's followers have been excommunicated several times, but they only laugh at the impotent rage of the Pope and his agents, the hierarchy.

THE BOUND VOLUMES OF **THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC** are valuable for libraries as works of reference. Volume I. is out of print long ago, but Volumes II. III. IV. V. and VI. can be had at this office, price \$1.50 each; or the five Volumes for \$6.00, if ordered at one time.

**TIMES ARE CHANGED.**

BY A BALTIMORE MINISTER.

**N**Othing is the change of the times more apparent than in the present attitude of Roman Catholics towards Protestantism. Less than fifty years ago it was impossible in any part of the country, where there were Romanists, for a Protestant or converted Catholic to discuss in public the Papal question without exciting fierce and intolerant opposition or riotous attempts at suppression. The domineering spirit of the Vatican, formerly prevailing, assumed and whenever able exercised the right to forbid, challenge, or suppress any and all public attempts to discuss the Roman religion.

Soon after the settlement of the late Rev. R. J. Breckenridge, D. D., in the Second Presbyterian Church of Baltimore, he discovered that a Romanist relative of one of his families was making efforts to pervert them to Romanism. To counteract this influence the doctor commenced a series of lectures on that subject, designed to point out the diversity of Rome's way of salvation from the Gospel of Christ. At the second or third lecture he was interrupted in his discourse by a stranger in the congregation who challenged his statements and demanded to be heard in reply.

This, of course, was refused, and amidst the brief confusion occasioned by this novel incident, the intruder, who proved to be a Catholic priest, and the instigator of the attempt at proselyting, was removed by the sexton.

About the same time, a Rev. Mr. Smith, a converted priest, was advertised to lecture on Romanism in the Third Presbyterian Church, on Eutaw

street, Baltimore—Dr. Musgrave's. On the night of the lecture the house at an early hour was crowded with a surging, restless congregation, while a tumultuous mob assembled in front of the building, extending far out into the street. They were very boisterous, denouncing the "renegade," "apostate" priest, and vowing vengeance if he dared to open his lips against "Holy Church."

Dr. Musgrave, who was in the pulpit with the ex-priest, comprehending the peril of the situation, prudently advised a postponement of the lecture; and after directing Mr. Smith to retire through an open window in the rear of the pulpit, the doctor dismissed the angry and disappointed crowd. The postponement of the lecture evidently saved the church edifice from wreck, and probably many persons from wounds or death.

Dr. Musgrave, however, was not a man to be foiled after that fashion. Very soon after the incident with Mr. Smith, he advertised a lecture on Romanism by his friend, Rev. William L. McColla, a man of war, whose weapons were both "carnal" and "spiritual." He had been an army chaplain with General Jackson, and from both habit and principle always went well armed, both in peace and war.

On the night of the lecture the house was again densely packed with an excited congregation, and a similar mob outside. At the appointed hour Chaplain McColla, accompanied by Dr. Musgrave, ascended the pulpit. Then exhibiting a large sword cane, he placed it at the side of the desk in full view of the congregation. When throwing off his military cloak, he drew from his coat pocket a pair of large cavalry pistols, which he care-

fully deposited one on each side of the open Bible. Then with great composure he looked over the great congregation and said: "My friends, I think we will have no disturbance tonight." And so it was. Having the "drop" on the rioters inside, he held them in perfect order while he delivered his lecture, and the word having been promptly passed to the rioters outside, they were restrained from violence lest damage should come to their associates within.

But now, the times with respect to Rome's brutal intolerance are materially changed. In Baltimore, at least, no Protestant pastor lecturing on Romanism would now be assaulted in his own pulpit by an audacious priest; nor would the public peace be broken by a lawless mob to suppress a discourse on "Reasons for Leaving the Church of Rome."

This changed and improved temper of Romanism has been exhibited notably in the respectful attention which has been paid by a large number of Catholics to Father O'Connor, the converted Catholic priest and Editor of *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC*, who, although preaching frequently and with great freedom on the once forbidden subject, has yet to experience from his former co-religionists anything inconsistent with the expression of liberality toward their "Protestant brethren," uttered by Cardinal Gibbons and members of the late Catholic Congress.

#### Rome Preparing for Conquest.

The Roman Catholic Bishop of North Dakota, Dr. Shanley, has had a railroad car built for his exclusive use in travelling through his diocese. His voice will be potent in the manipulation and management of State and financial

affairs in the great North-west, for he will demonstrate to the magnates that he can control and subdue the Roman Catholic immigrants that constitute such a large portion of the population of the new State. Thus does Rome extend and increase her influence in the new settlements as well as in the large cities of the country. If the political and financial leaders should ignore Bishop Shanley's onward march for the conquest of the United States, then they may look for strikes and disturbances, and consequent financial losses. No one man in Minnesota wields more influence than Archbishop Ireland, and Bishop Shanley is following his example in North Dakota. Archbishop Ireland expects to be made a Cardinal one of these days as a reward for his great speech at the Catholic Congress in Baltimore last November when he said: "The great work which the Catholics of the United States are called to do within the coming century is to make America Catholic. If we love our Church, to mention the work suffices. Our cry shall be 'God wills it,' and our hearts shall leap with crusader enthusiasm."

#### One Defeat for Rome.

The confirmation of General Morgan as Indian Commissioner and Dr. Daniel Dorchester as Superintendent of Indian Education by the United States Senate last month was a severe blow to the Roman hierarchy, which had used every means to defeat them. General Sherman's Jesuit son, Father Sherman, and another priest, Father Stevens, under the direction of Cardinal Gibbons were indefatigable in their efforts to bulldoze the Senate; but Rome was badly beaten this time.

## IRELAND AND ROME.

**W**HILE the Irish Roman Catholics and their descendants in this country are celebrating St. Patrick's Day, March 17, we would direct their attention to the bull of Pope Adrian IV., issued in 1154, granting Ireland to the English King Henry II.—“To announce the truth of the Christian [Roman] religion to an ignorant and barbarous people [the Irish]. . . . And to make every house pay the tribute of one penny to St. Peter and the Church of Rome.”

Regarding the genuineness of this bull the distinguished Roman Catholic historian, Rev. John Lanigan, D. D., in his Ecclesiastical History of Ireland, Vol. IV, p. 164, says: “Adrian’s bull is of so unwarrantable and unjustifiable a nature, that some writers could not bring themselves to believe that he issued it and have endeavored to prove it a forgery; but their efforts were of no avail, and never did their exist a more real or authentic document.”

We give at considerable length the verdict of other Roman Catholic historians of acknowledged ability on this case:

“Some Irish historians have questioned the authenticity of Pope Adrian’s bull; but there appears to be no solid reason for doubt upon the subject. See this point ably handled by Dr. Lanigan (Ecclesiastical History, Vol. IV., p. 164), also the notes and illustrations of the *Macariae Excidium*, page 242. Adrian’s bull appears in the *Bullarium Romanum*, though Alexander’s bull does not. It was inserted by Radulfus of Diceto, a contemporary writer, in his *Imagines Historiarum*, and was published by Car-

dinal Baronius from a *Codex Vaticanus*. It was recited by the Irish princes in their remonstrance to John XXII., in the reign of Edward II., and appears in the *Scoti Chronicon* of John of Fordun, and in other old writers.”—History of Ireland, by Martin Haverty, c. xviii, p. 205.

“Some zealous champions, as well of the Papacy as of Ireland, have endeavored, but without success, to demonstrate that both this bull—Adrian’s—and the bull of Alexander III. confirming it, are, upon the face of them, rank forgeries. See Gratianus Lucius, *loc. citat.*; and the Abbe Geoghegan’s History of Ireland, Vol. I., c. 7. The chief argument of the latter writer is founded on the improbability, as he conceives, that neither of these Popes could have thought of selecting as an apostle for the reformation of Ireland so irreligious and profligate a prince as Henry II.”—History of Ireland, by Thomas Moore, Vol. I., c. xxvi.

“A host of contemporaneous writers allude to the bull. A bull granted by Alexander III. in a few subsequent years justifies itself by the bull granted by Adrian. In all succeeding ages, the general belief in the authenticity of the bull was never questioned. In the first quarter of the fourteenth century in a petition of grievances sent by the Irish to Rome, the bull is spoken of as an unquestionable fact even by the Popes themselves. Even in the sixteenth century Cardinal Pole says distinctly that it was from his too great love of country Pope Adrian granted the bull to Henry II. Baronius states that he found the bull of Pope Adrian in the Vatican archives.

The bull is given in the *Bullarium* of Coqueline and by Cherubini. Nor is it an uncommon thing to expunge an obnoxious bull from the *Bullarium*. The bull of Adrian V., in 1565, against Henry of Navarre and published in Rome, is not given in the *Bullarium Romanum*, because Henry, by and by, was reconciled to the Church. Nor is there any the least reason to suppose that John of Salisbury would sacrifice conscience in reference to the bull for the sake of Henry. For in 1167 writing to the Prior of Kent, William, he says: 'Spes est Domino ut vociferantibus tubis sacerdotalibus, in proximo corruat et Henrico,' etc.—Ep. 210, Bibl. Patrum, tom. xiii. He re-commended that the spiritual sword should be drawn and excommunication hurled against Henry in the case of St. Thomas A'Becket; so that when John of Salisbury assures us he obtained the bull for Henry, it is unreasonable to suppose that he lied in order to prop up the claim of Henry II."—Church History of Ireland, by Sylvester Malone, C. C., cap. ii. col. 29, 30.

"Gratianns Lucius (Lynch) greatly exerted himself (Cambr. Evers. cap. 22) in striving to show that the bull is spurious, and MacGeoghegan would fain make us believe the same thing. It has not indeed been published in the *Bullarium Romanum*, the editors of which were ashamed of it. But there was a copy of it in the Vatican library, as is clear from its being referred to by Pope John XXII. in his Brief to Edward II. of England, written in 1319, which Brief is in the *Bullarium*, and may be seen in Wilkins' 'Councils,' Vol. II., p. 491., in Brodin's 'Descriptio regni Hiberniae,' printed at Rome in 1721, and in 'Mac-

Geoghegan's History,' etc., tom. 2. p. 116. In said Brief the Pope not only refers to Adrian's bull or letter by name, but says that he joins to the Brief a copy of it for the use of the king. And Baronius, who has published the bull in his 'Annales,' etc., at "A." 1159 (not because he thought it was issued in that year), tells us that he took his copy of it from a *codex Vaticanus*. Then we have the testimony of the very intriguer employed in procuring this bull, John of Salisbury, who just before the words quoted (*Not prec.*) has; 'Ad preces meas illustri regi Anglorum Henrico II. concessit (Adrianus) et dedit Hiberniam jure haereditario possidendam, sicut literae ipsius testantur in hodiernum diem. Nam omnes insulae de jure antiquo, ex donatione Constantini qui eam fundavit et dotavit, dicuntur ad Romanam ecclesiam pertinere. Annulum quoque,' etc. Lynch, having seen this passage, thought that it was supposed to be taken from the 'Polycraticus' of John of Salisbury, and then argues that it is not in the genuine 'Polycraticus.' But he ought to have known that it was quoted not from the 'Polycraticus,' but from another of John's works entitled 'Metalogicus.' Adrian's grant of Ireland to Henry is expressly mentioned and confirmed by Pope Alexander III. in his letter to him of the year 1172. Giraldus Cambrensis ('De rebus a segestis,' part 2, cap. 11, and 'Hiberni expugn,' L. 2, c. 6), Matthew Paris ('Historia major,' etc., ad "A." 1155) and others give not only an account of said bull, but the bull itself; and Usher states ('Sylloge,' not on No. 46) that he saw copies of it in the registers of the diocese of Dublin and Lismore. What has been

now said is surely more than enough to set aside the doubts of Lynch or of any other writer."—Ecclesiastical History of Ireland, by Rev. John Lanigan, D. D., Vol. IV., pp. 165, 166.

"The late Dr. Kelly, of Maynooth, in his notes to the twenty-second chapter of 'Cambrensis Eversus,' says: 'It has not been considered necessary to adduce in the notes of this chapter any additional proofs of the authenticity of Adrian's letter. Dr. Lanigan, Vol. IV. p. 165, and the 'Macariae Excidium,' p. 242, must satisfy the most sceptical on that point.'" (Camb. Ever., by Dr. Kelly, II. 466, note.)—Ecclesiastical History of Ireland, by W. D. Killen, D. D., Vol. I. p. 214.

### The American Flag.

The patriotic impulse to place the American Flag on the public schools has seized upon the whole Nation. Everywhere we hear of "flag raising." The Legislatures of several States have passed laws commending this purpose, and soon we shall have an American Flag floating over every public school in the United States.

Will it be credited that the Roman hierarchy have issued orders to the priests to place flags on the parochial schools also? Such is the fact, and with brazen impudence they even ask the Legislatures to make appropriations of money for the purchase of flags for their anti American schools.

### Three Good Books for \$2.50.

We will send the Nun of Kenmare's new book, "Life Inside the Church of Rome," Dr. Lansing's "Romanism the Republic," an Rev. Geo. C. Needham's beautiful story, "Father Flynn," to any address for \$2.50. The Nun of Kenmare's new book alone is \$1.75. Address orders to this office.

### The Jesuits in Brazil.

It is becoming more and more apparent that the revolution in Brazil was a rebellion against the Roman Church quite as much as against the Empire. The New York *Tribune* sent a staff correspondent to that country to give a report of the causes of the revolution and its developments, and from his letter to that paper dated Rio, December 28, 1889, and published in the issue for February 3, 1890, we make the following extracts:

"Senhor Ruy Barboza, one of the Ministers of the Provisional Government, in an interview outlined the causes of the revolution. He said: 'The Emperor's daughter, Princess Isabel, was the real head of the State. Surrounded by Jesuits, she had no will of her own. Priests were always about her and clericalism was threatening to become a menace to Brazilian liberty.'

We need not quote more. It is the same story in Brazil in our day as it was in all European countries in the past. The Jesuits wanted to rule and the people rebelled. The Brazilians could not obtain liberty while the Jesuits were in power. The lesson should be heeded by the American people who are allowing the Jesuitical Cardinal and his hierarchy to build up the power of Rome in this country to a height unknown at present in any European country.

A correspondent of the New York *Herald*, February 17, 1890, writing to that paper from Brazil, says a decree has been issued by the new Republic abolishing "Saints' Days" and establishing secular holidays, such as May 13, the anniversary of the abolition of slavery, and November 15, the declaration of the Republic.

---

KEY NOTES FROM ROME--ROMANISM AND THE REPUBLIC

---

**I**N a very able article, "Key Notes from Rome," in the February *Forum*, Mr. Henry Charles Lea, of Philadelphia, the learned author of the "History of the Inquisition," "An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy," and "Studies in Church History," shows that the organization and teachings of the Roman Church are hostile to American institutions. The article is a long one, but we will condense it for our readers. It begins as follows:

At the lay congress of the Roman Catholic Church of the United States held in Baltimore November last, the genial and gifted Mr. Daniel Dougherty complained that

"We . . . American Roman Catholics . . . have silently submitted to wrongs and injustices in manifold shapes and from time immemorial. . . . The highest honors of the Republic are denied to us by a prejudice that has all the force of a constitutional amendment. . . . Political parties in the past have sought to deprive us of our constitutional rights, and we are branded as tools of a foreign potentate and unworthy to enjoy the name of Americans."

Perhaps the eloquent orator may obtain an inkling of the cause of this apparent injustice if he will weigh the words of a speaker who followed him, Father Nugent, of Liverpool, who stated that the idea of the congress had originated with the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster and the Archbishop of St. Paul, and who added, in rhetoric slightly mixed: "But I hope now the key note will be seized and bind us together in the great social questions of our people." Herein lies the trouble. The Catholic Church is not American or independent; it looks

broad and not at home for guidance. When the third plenary council of Baltimore was convoked, in 1884, its proceedings had all to be arranged the year before in Rome with the Congregation of Propaganda; and when its sessions closed they were sent to Leo XIII., who modified them at his pleasure.

The bishops who rule the American church are all appointed by the Pope, for the transmission of three names by the provincial suffragans, when a vacancy occurs, is simply advisory and in no way limits the Papal discretion of selection. Even so trivial a matter as the introduction of electric lighting in the churches, we are told, has to be referred to the decision of the Propaganda, which a recent traveler describes as containing no representative of the English-speaking people save a venerable Irish Benedictine.

Thus the interest of "our people" in "great social questions" is apt not to be the same as that of the people at large, and the faithful are bound together with a "key note" which is sounded in Rome. If they are "branded as tools of a foreign potentate" the brand is self-inflicted; and if they are denied the highest honors of the Republic it is not through an unreasoning prejudice, but through the instinctive popular perception that they owe obedience to a higher law than that which binds their fellow citizens.

In saying this I would not for a moment call in question the good faith or the patriotism of Mr. Dougherty, which no one who knows him will impugn. Nor do I forget the distinguished services of General Sheridan, whose ele-

vation as the successor of Generals Grant and Sherman shows that no unworthy jealousy prevents the Nation from entrusting with positions of high honor and responsibility Catholics who have deserved well of the Republic. Yet the questions raised by Mr. Dougherty are not to be dismissed with a reference to individuals. The principles involved underlie the whole social organization; in considering them we cannot disregard the lessons of the past and the warnings of the present, which fully justify what Mr. Dougherty complains of as an injustice. . . . The power of the Papacy grew up in rude and uncivilized times, when the law of the strongest was dominant in secular concerns, and when the moral forces were feeble and scarce found expression save through the Church. . . . The men who guided the Church claimed and obtained the right of control in every relation of human life. Its head was the living representative of Christ on earth. He spoke in the name of God. . . . He was the sole judge of his own authority, and Pope Boniface VIII., in the bull "*Unam Sanctam*" [1294-1301], which still retains its place in the Roman canon law, defined it to be an article of faith, necessary to salvation, that every human being is subject to the Roman pontiff. . . . The history of the Papacy from the time of Gregory VII., in the eleventh century, is a history of political intrigues and wars, in which every kingdom in turn was obliged to struggle to retain control over its internal affairs, and the interests of Christianity were too often held subordinate to those of the possessor of the patrimony of the church.

It is the misfortune of an infallible

church that it can confess no errors. Whatever it has once formally claimed, becomes its imprescriptible right which it cannot abandon without being recreant to the trust divinely confided to it. . . . Pius IX. condemned as an error the assertion that the Popes had ever exceeded the limits of their authority or had usurped the rights of princes. Not content with this, he condemned as another error the proposition that the Roman pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself with progress, liberalism and modern civilization—a declaration that recently found an unexpected echo on this side of the Atlantic in Cardinal Gibbons' unseemly harangue on the occasion of the monument dedicated to Giordano Bruno. . . . St. Alphonso de Liguori, declared in 1871 to be a "Doctor of the Church," says in his "Moral Theology," book 1, that all who have been admitted to Christianity by the waters of baptism, even though they may be heretics, are bound by the precepts of the Church, and must render implicit obedience to Rome, and that the Pope is justified in making good his supremacy wherever the opportunity offers. How complete is that supremacy and how tenaciously it has been maintained was shown in the question of the oath of allegiance under James I. of England.

When, in 1569, St. Pius V. excommunicated Queen Elizabeth, deposed her and released all her subjects from their allegiance, it became customary to question all Catholic missionary priests in England as to whether they considered the Papal action binding, and whether the Pope had a right to incite subjects to rebellion. Finally, under James I., after the warning of

the gunpowder plot, this took the shape of offering to them an oath of allegiance, in which they were required to swear that they would not regard any such bull, but would render true and honest obedience to the sovereign. All allusion to the royal supremacy over the Church of England was carefully omitted and the obligation was confined simply to temporal duty. Of the two clauses that were peculiarly objected to at Rome the first was:

"And I do further swear, that I do from my heart abhor, detest and abjure as impious and heretical this damnable doctrine and position, that princes who are excommunicated and deprived by the Pope may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any one whatsoever."

The second simply disclaimed belief in the Papal power to absolve the juror from the oath. The first person to whom it was administered was George Blackwell, who for nine years had been archpriest and head of the Catholic mission in England, and he recommended all his brethren to follow his example. As soon as the news of this reached Rome Cardinal Bellarmine wrote to Blackwell, sharply reproving him for taking an illicit oath derogatory to the primacy of the holy See in place of preferring the glory of martyrdom; and Paul V. accompanied this with a brief addressed to all English Catholics sternly forbidding them to yield. The oath, he said, could not be taken without infringing the Catholic faith, and he expected them rather to welcome torture and death. A year later, on learning that some of them doubted the genuineness of the brief, he wrote again to inform them that it had been framed after mature deliberation, and that it must be obeyed at whatever cost to them of property or life. King James sallied forth with an "Apology"

to justify his demand of the oath, and called the attention of all Christian princes to the slender tenure by which they held their thrones. Cardinal Bellarmine responded, and essayed to prove that kings held their thrones on condition of obedience to the Church. An Englishman named John Mole, who happened in Florence to show a copy of King James's "Apology" to an acquaintance, was seized by the Inquisition, and died in its prison after thirty years' incarceration; and Paul V. looked serenely on while his missionaries in England suffered the penalties of high treason for refusal to take the oath. In all this, Pius IX. tells us, the Church never exceeded its rightful authority. . . . All this is not merely a matter of historical interest. In the bull "*Apostolice Sedis*," of October 12, 1869, Pius IX. inflicts excommunication, *ipso facto*, and removable only by the Pope himself, on all who shall impede, directly or indirectly, ecclesiastical jurisdiction in either the *forum internum* or the *forum externum*, or shall procure an appeal to the secular courts, or in any way aid or abet such an attempt.

In this same bull a similar condemnation is pronounced against all who shall endeavor to subject ecclesiastics to the jurisdiction of the secular courts. Clerical immunity from secular law during the middle ages was an abuse which worked enormous injury to both Church and State. In spite of the remonstrances of the Catholic princes, the Council of Trent emphatically refused to surrender the privilege; but it was gradually curtailed in one State after another, and the remnant was swept away in most countries by the revolution, which did so much to ren-

der all men equal before the law. In Catholic eyes this is a foul wrong. The ecclesiastic is a privileged being, under no obligation to obey the laws of the land and not amenable to them.

When Napoleon negotiated the Concordat of 1801, he provided by decree that an *appel comme d'abus* should lie to the Council of State for all contraventions of the law by ecclesiastics. Against this Pius VII. energetically protested, through his legate, Cardinal Caprara, pointing out that the laws might be in opposition to the faith, when the government could not expect priests to obey them. Many of the laws of every modern State are in opposition to the faith as expounded by the Vatican, and are, therefore, not binding; while, if an ecclesiastic commits a crime and is subjected to a jury trial, it is an invasion of the rights of the Church, which submits because it is powerless in these evil days to enforce them. Pius IX., in the apostolical letter "*Multiplices inter*," June 10, 1851, expressly declared that clerical immunity, both as to person and property, is an ordinance of God and in no way derived from civil law. As such it must be an article of faith, which the Church has no power to abandon.

I have touched only on a few of the numerous points in which the domain of the Church, as defined by the Vatican, extends over what in modern political systems belongs exclusively to the secular power; but these will suffice to show what ample opportunity the Papacy enjoys of intervening in the internal affairs of States. To what extent it will do this is simply a question of policy or of temperament.

These decrees of the Roman Church are binding on the soul of every Catho-

lic in whatever land he may dwell, for it is his duty to obey the voice of the vicegerent of God in preference to the commands of earthly rulers. The Church, as Pius IX. declared in the apostolic letter "*Jam vos*," of September 13, 1868, wields an authority granted by God to govern human beings and to regulate the actions of every man both in private life and social activity. As the theocratic ruler of the Church, it is the Pope who decides how this universal authority shall be exercised. The oath embodied in the Catholic profession of faith is not as sensational as that taken to the prophets in the Endowment House at Salt Lake City, which recently has been judicially decided to render those who take it incapable of naturalization, but it is none the less binding on the conscience of the sincere believer:

"I acknowledge the holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church as the mother and mistress of all churches; and I pledge and swear true obedience to the Roman pontiff and vicar of Jesus Christ and successor of the blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles." (Acts and Decrees of the Council of Baltimore, 1884.)

In this, it will be observed, there are no reserves; no exception is made of allegiance due to the State, and in the wide field of conflicting sovereignty the duty to obey the Pope is absolute over the duty to obey the laws. Henry VIII. might well complain to his Parliament in 1532 that the clergy were but half subjects to him in consequence of their oaths to the Pope. The same is true to-day. It was only a few weeks ago that in the Bavarian Landtag the Catholic deputies were forced to admit that they did not regard their oath of office in the sense attached to it by the State. The conscientious Catholic, in fact, is of necessity but half a citizen;

he can give but a secondary allegiance to the land of his birth or of his adoption. Is it our fault if, in the words of Mr. Dougherty, he is "branded as the tool of a foreign potentate"? . . . Sooner or later the time will come when there will be at least a prospect of ousting the Subalpine government and restoring to the Pope the control of the Papal States. The heart of every true Catholic on earth will be fired, and every Catholic pulpit will resound with appeals to aid the holy cause with prayers and money and men. If then the political situation were such that the intervention of the United States would turn the scale, can we doubt that the most urgent commands would come from the holy See to obedient American bishops, and that all true Catholics with fierce enthusiasm would labor to effect it? Can we doubt also that promises and threats would be freely used with political managers? Mr. Charles J. Bonaparte, of Baltimore, does not leave us to guess where his sympathies would lie. In a paper on this subject read before the Catholic Congress he tells us: "We demand, not that he—the Pope—be granted privileges as though he were a sovereign, but that, since he is and always must be a sovereign, his existing rights as a sovereign be respected." If, then, in such a conjuncture as I have suggested, Mr. Bonaparte were President or Secretary of State, could the country rely upon him for the unclouded intellect and unbiased judgment necessary to resist the clamor of ten millions, or perhaps by that time of twenty millions, of our people? . . . Yet I would not be supposed to believe that all, or even a majority, of our Catholic citizens are con-

sciously "tools of a foreign potentate." Outside of the priesthood probably but few of them realize the extent of the reserved claim on their allegiance held by the holy See. Even as the Catholic Lord Howard of Effingham commanded the fleet which in 1588 destroyed the Spanish Armada, twenty years after St. Pius V. had deposed Queen Elizabeth, so on any supreme question a large portion of our Catholics would very likely range themselves on the side of patriotism against priestcraft, as did the Irish on the occasion of the Papal rescript. But these supreme questions are of rare occurrence, while there are minor ones liable constantly to arise, on which plausible casuistry can mislead them into an attitude wholly antagonistic to the spirit of our institutions.

I can imagine, moreover, that in the surprises which time has in store for us there may possibly lie the solution of the problem in a thoroughly American way. The triumph of Ultramontanism in the Church has been too thorough; the national churches have been too completely crushed out, and Papal autocracy has been established too unreservedly. All this is so repugnant to the American habit of thought that already there are occasional symptoms of unconscious rebellion, which in time may ripen to overt revolution, resulting in the organization of a national American Catholic Church, faithful to all dogmas of Catholicism save the central one of the supremacy of the so-called successor of St. Peter. Because Old Catholicism has not prevailed in Europe, it does not follow that it might not succeed in the less conservative and freer atmosphere of America.

**Methodists Against Romanists.**

At the Methodist ministers' meeting in Washington, D. C., February 3, 1890, Rev. C. W. Baldwin called attention to the efforts now being made by the Roman Catholic priesthood of the District to defeat the confirmation by the Senate of Messrs. Morgan and Dorchester, nominees for the Indian Bureau and Superintendence of the Indian Schools. After some informal discussion a committee, consisting of Messrs. Baldwin and Price, was appointed to present to the Senate a resolution favoring the confirmation of those gentlemen. One of the most active lobbyists in Congress at this time is a Catholic priest, backed by the whole hierarchy of the country, bound to prevent these nominees from being confirmed.

Miss Jane Bancroft, Ph. D., the general agent of the Society of Deaconesses in connection with the Methodist Episcopal Church, also addressed the meeting on the necessity of such institutions, in view of the strenuous efforts of the Catholic Church to control the education of the rising generation. In Buffalo especially the Papists have complete control of the educational department of the city, loyalty to American institutions being much below par there. In her judgment it is high time for Americans to assert their supremacy and maintain at all hazards the institutions guaranteed to us by our forefathers. The Catholic hierarchy are not fighting Morgan and Dorchester, but liberty of speech and American institutions.

The Methodist Episcopal Church intends to found a national university in Washington, and arrangements are making for the purchase of a ninety

acre tract of land on the Tennallytown road, near Oakview, ex-President Cleveland's country home, as a site for the university. Bishop Hurst, whose residence is in Washington, is at the head of the movement, and has paid an option of \$1,000 on the property, which is to be sold for \$100,000. The bishop said that the sale had not yet been closed.

"Will it be?" he was asked.

"I think so. My main object now is to get an expression of the feelings of the Methodists throughout the United States on the question. I have received some very encouraging letters from different parts of the country."

"Have any liberal subscriptions been made?"

"Several, and not all from the Methodist denomination, either. I expect aid and encouragement from all Protestant churches. The building of the university is a question of very deep interest to us, and it is necessary to make haste slowly."

During a visit to Washington last month we learned that the first subscription of \$1,000 to this proposed Protestant University was from a member of the Baptist Church.

\*\*\*

**Episcopalians Against Rome.**

The Baltimore *Sun*, February 12 1890, published the following:

"The Right Rev. William Paret, Bishop of Maryland, delivered yesterday morning a charge to about eighty Protestant Episcopal clergymen of the diocese at St. Paul's Church, Charles and Saratoga streets. The bishop of a diocese generally gives a charge to the clergy on some important subject once in every three years. Bishop Paret said: 'This city is the central

point of Roman Catholicism in this country. Here resides its highest prelate, and here it puts forth its greatest effort. It is using political and social influence to obtain the religious control of this Nation. God forbid that I should blame the Catholics for any honest effort made by them toward this end. The issue, however, is greater than ever before, and they are now concentrating all their hopes and plans in this land. We must meet their advance with loving resistance. Three-fourths of their numbers were born in Europe, and nearly all of the remainder are children of foreign-born parents. The foreign spirit in the Church is remarkably powerful. Their members become Americanized very slowly, and are not being assimilated rapidly. Our rights as citizens and churchmen are menaced by this power. The laws of naturalization are abused, and an immigrant often becomes a voter before he has caught our tongue. We have been neglectful in calling the attention of our parishioners to the encroachment of the Roman Catholic Church.

"When any movement is made by them detrimental to our political or social institutions do not be silent, but speak out bold and clear on the subject."

This is a most significant and encouraging sign of the times. When the representatives of a great Church like the Protestant Episcopal speak out boldly warning the American people against the growing power of the Roman Catholic Chnrch in this country, every one who has in any wise called attention to this subject must thank God and take courage. All Protestant Churches should unite against the Pope's Church.

### The Church of Christ

The Rev. Dr. John Hall of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, in the course of his sermon January 19, 1890, said:

"The Church of Christ has a noble mission. The 'Golden Candlestick' of Revelation 1: 28, is its fitting symbol. Its make-up is precious, consisting not of mere hearers, or admirers of a man, or curious spectators, or mere maintainers of a good custom, but of believing souls converted to God, 'partakers of a divine nature, and members of the spiritual body of Christ. The material of the candlestick is golden, and the use of it is to hold up the light—light that God kindles, and which He enlightens with the light of life. The Church has to edify, to feed, to help forward by the truth these believers, and to attract to the life-giving Saviour their children and all others whom she can approach.

"If a church fails in these forms of work, the failure is complete and enduring. If this is done the church may be poor or obscure, but she is serving her chief end. Her instrument is the Word of God, her work is spiritual. Let us not forget this. If we go into a church for social or business considerations we carry corrupting elements with us, and are not likely to get spiritual good. Let us remember then that the main use of the church is to get the heavenly light into our souls, and then, one by one, and as a body, to make this light shine for the good of others." . . .

WHEN ORDERING THE NUN OF KEN-MARE's books please state whether you wish "Life Inside the Church of Rome" or her "Autobiography." The price of her new book, "Life Inside the Church of Rome," is \$1.75.

## THE PRIMACY OF ST. PETER.

BY REV. THOS. CONNELLAN, LATE ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIEST, ATHLONE, IRELAND.

## I.

**M**R. GLADSTONE, in his famous reply to Cardinal Newman, said that his opponent "based the claim of his Church on three texts of Scripture—'Feed my sheep' (John xxi: 15-17), of which Archbishop Kenrick says that the very words are disputed and the meaning forced; 'Strengthen thy brethren,' which has no reference whatever to doctrine, but only, if its force extend beyond the immediate occasion, to government; and 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church,' when it is notorious that the large majority of the early expositors declare the rock to be, not the person, but the previous confession of St. Peter, where, moreover, let it be remembered, if his person is really meant, there is no distinction between *ex-cathedra* and non *ex cathedra* decisions, but the entire proceedings of his ministry are included."

Upon this argument Mr. Gladstone continues his commentary. "Into three texts, then, it seems, the Church of Rome has at length, in the course of centuries, acquired this deep insight. In the study of these three fragments how much else has she forgotten? The total ignorance of St. Peter himself respecting his monarchy; the exercise of the defining office not by him, but by St. James in the Council of Jerusalem; the world-wide commission specially and directly given to St. Paul; the correction of St. Peter by the Apostle of the Gentiles; the independent action of all the Apostles; the twelve foundations of the new Jerusa-

lem; And in them the name of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb.'" (Vaticanism, page 97.)

Indeed, there is no Scriptural evidence of any privilege conferred upon Peter which was not also conferred upon and exercised by the other Apostles. The Church of Rome holds that Peter was a rock, and that upon that rock Christ's Church was to be founded. But the other Apostles were also rocks, for St. John, in the Apocalypse (xxi: 10-14), tells us that the wall of the heavenly Jerusalem "had twelve foundations," on which were inscribed "the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb." The keys of the kingdom of heaven were, we are told, committed to Peter. So also were they to the other Apostles. They had power direct from Christ to open the door of the Church by instruction, persuasion, dispensing of the sacraments; and they had power to close it by the exclusion of scandalous or heretical persons. Nay, they bestowed this same power on those whom they constituted pastors in Christ's Church. Did Christ give to Peter power to bind and loose? Yes, and to the other Apostles also in the self same words. The same divine Shepherd who said (Matt. xvi: 19), "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven," said also (Matt. xviii: 18) to the assembled twelve, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Was Peter's commission universal? So was theirs, and by the same immediate authority. "All power is given unto Me

in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. xxviii: 19, 20.) These are Christ's last words to His Apostles, and where is there any evidence of a special primacy conferred upon Peter. Again, if this primacy of jurisdiction had been conferred upon Peter he would certainly have used it, have asserted his authority, have acted as Pope over the universal Church during the many years of his after life. And yet it is an extraordinary fact that neither in the Acts of the Apostles, nor in the two Catholic epistles written by St. Peter, nor in any of the writings of St. Paul, do we find the remotest allusion to such an authority.

In his first Catholic epistle (v. 1) he writes: "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ." There is very little of the Pope here. There is no arrogant assumption of authority. Oh, no! The great Apostle, whom the Popes profess to imitate, merely designates himself an elder, and speaks to his brother elders as an equal to an equal. In the Acts of the Apostles wherein, as St. Chrysostom says, "we may see the predictions of Christ reduced to action," where is there any proof of Peter's supremacy? At the institution of the deacons (Acts vi: 2) the twelve called the multitudes of the disciples and directed them to elect the persons. The candidates were led before the Apostles: "And when they prayed they laid their hands upon them." In that important dispute

about the Mosaical institutions, when Paul and Barnabas were unable to settle the matter, they were sent to Jerusalem "unto the Apostles and elders" for advice. And the Apostles and elders being assembled, many spoke, Peter, Paul and Barnabas among the number; after which James reviewed the arguments and pronounced the decision: "Wherefore my sentence is that we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles are turned to God." Accordingly a pastoral letter was addressed to the Gentiles, commencing thus: "The Apostles and elders and brethren send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles." (Acts xv.)

Now here is a most remarkable synod assembled in Jerusalem to decide on a knotty point about which there had been much dispute. Surely if Peter had been made primate over the other Apostles it would have been his privilege to convoke the synod, to preside over it and to transmit its decisions to the universal Church. But none of these things happened. The members of the synod assembled by common agreement. The president is St. James, "to whom," says St. Chrysostom, "as Bishop of Jerusalem, the government was committed." The decision is forwarded to the Gentile churches in the names of the Apostles, elders and brethren. When, on that famous ride to Damascus, the light of truth, like vivid lightning, smote Saul to the ground, he was not sent to Peter for instruction and jurisdiction, as would be natural if Peter was head of the Church. Ananias of Damascus, "a devout man," was Christ's minister in receiving and baptizing the new convert.

Without stopping to quote all those texts in which Paul declares himself

"to be inferior in nothing to the very chief Apostles," let us examine that wonderful passage (Gal. 11: 11) in which he tells us that he publicly reproved Peter for his duplicity: "But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withheld him to the face." Now, if Peter had been Paul's superior, if he had been infallible, if he was superior to a general council, as we are informed the Pope is, is it likely that the Apostle of the Gentiles would have "withheld him to the face?" Hildebrand lays it down that "the Pope can be judged by no man," yet here is Peter rebuked by Paul, and the correction is meekly accepted.

Nay, more; if it was clear as noon-day that St. Peter had a primacy of jurisdiction conferred on him by Christ, and that he used that primacy during his lifetime—two propositions no man can prove—still there would be a link wanting in Rome's chain of evidence. For the Pope claims his jurisdiction as successor to St. Peter in the See of Rome. And was St. Peter Bishop of Rome? Well, in the first place he was not, properly speaking, a bishop at all. He was an apostle, and as such possessed an office far superior to that of a bishop. The functions of the apostle and the bishop differed widely. The apostle, like the prophet or evangelist, held no local office. He was essentially, as his name denotes, a missionary moving about from place to place founding and constructing new churches. The man deputed by an apostle to govern such a new foundation was designated a presbyter or elder, and the term later on changed *episkopos*, or bishop. Hence it would be exceedingly strange if St. Peter, endowed, as all the Apostles were, with

universal jurisdiction, should put his light under a bushel, renounce his Apostolicship, and become Bishop of Rome. We know that St. Peter lived at Babylon, and he is also said to have been at Antioch, but for the statement that he was Bishop of Rome there is no evidence except a very shadowy tradition. Now, why should not the bishops of Antioch or Babylon have as good a claim to a primacy of jurisdiction as the Bishop of Rome? The same tradition makes St. Paul Bishop of Rome also, conjointly with St. Peter; a circumstance which deprives it of any claim to attention. Again, If St. Peter was Bishop of Rome how very extraordinary it is that there is not a syllable about it in the Acts of the Apostles, or in the writings of St. Paul. This wonderful prerogative of the Church of Rome was a matter of paramount importance to hundreds of millions of souls. Yet the writer of the Acts never says a syllable about Peter's being Bishop of Rome or residing there. St. Paul wrote an epistle to the Romans, admired more and more every day for its beauty and wonderful treatment of the doctrine of justification by faith; he saluted quite a crowd of persons then resident at Rome, but never once does he mention Peter. He resided for fully two years at Rome, living in a private house, to which the Roman Christians had free access; from that house he wrote to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians and the second of his epistles to Timothy; he sends salutations from persons in his company; he speaks of those who deserted and those who remained faithful, but there is not the slightest allusion to Peter.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

**'WIFE, I HAVE IT NOW.'**

BY GEO. C. NEEDHAM.

WHEN preaching in a Canadian city a gentleman of intelligence attended our special meetings, though at first merely to gratify curiosity. Previously he had made no profession of religion. Although outwardly a strictly moral man, many wondered why he did not connect himself with the church; but he knew that he was not "born again," and that only those who have truly become the children of God have any right to a place in the assembly of believers. After attending a few of the services he became convicted of sin, and alarmed lest he die unsaved. When in this state of mind he invited me to his house that I might talk with him freely of the salvation that is in Christ Jesus. Then he laid open his heart and its anxieties. Having lived for fifty years a secret unbeliever he supposed that he had now much to do before he could become a truly saved man. But, like a person awaking from a dream, he was astonished to learn that he had nothing to do but to rest in a work already accomplished; and that, by virtue of that work, the sinner is accepted the moment he believes on the Lord Jesus Christ who can save to the uttermost all who come unto God by Him. This truth engrossed his thoughts for many days. Still he had not found peace, because he did not believe. He sought for an extraordinary glow of feeling; he expected a sudden thrill of emotion, instead of by faith looking to Jesus, even as the Israelites looked to the brazen serpent.

One night after hearing a Gospel sermon he entered his house with

gloomy forebodings, sad and sorrowful. His wife, who had been a Christian woman for many years, moved the Bible towards him. He understood her meaning, and read a chapter aloud. By a significant look she intimated her desire that they should kneel together and implore the divine blessing. But he could not be a hypocrite and say, "Our Father," when he knew that he was not yet "born of God." He rose and paced the room, and at length went to his chamber in a condition bordering on despair. But now the blessed moment had arrived when the captive should be delivered and the light of the Gospel illumine his dark heart. Having continued awake for many hours, his mind reverted to the discourse of the previous evening, which had made a deep impression on him. The text was the passage of John III: 16—"For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." "God so loved the world," thought he. "God *loved*—so *LOVED*!" Now his thoughts became occupied with God and His great love to him. Abandoning all his efforts to awaken love to God in his own heart, he dwelt further on the blessed theme—"God loved the world; God sent His Son; Jesus Christ came into the world—into the world—that *whosoever* believeth in Him—*BELIEVETH IN HIM—should not perish.*" He thought again—"Whosoever believeth"—and suddenly exclaimed joyfully, "WIFE, I HAVE IT NOW; I see it all. Thanks be to God." Then he told her it was clear. Yes, he was saved. With tears of joy he began to bless God, repeating over and over the comforting words, "For God so loved

the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him, should not perish, but have everlasting life."

He thus reasoned: God sent His Son to die for sinners; He died for *me*. God says, "Whosoever believeth in Him is saved." I believe; yes, I now trust alone in Jesus Christ, and I also believe what God says, *that I am saved*. Reader, merely repeating the form of this statement will not save you; but FAITH IN CHRIST will undoubtedly secure to you ETERNAL LIFE. To believe is your part; salvation is God's work, which He has promised to bestow on all them that believe. He will assuredly do this; He has never failed to save the believing soul. Cast yourself, then, upon His mercy through Christ, boldly relying on His divine promises. Then shall your peace flow as a river, and your righteousness as the waves of the sea.

The assurance of salvation is clearly taught in the Scriptures. It is the privilege of all believers in the Lord Jesus Christ to know that they have passed from death unto life. And yet many who confess the name of Jesus, who wear the Christian garb, members of churches and chapels, orthodox in creed, sound in doctrine, conscientious in duty, precise in form, who attend the prayer meeting, who advocate revivals, and who are willing to promote the preaching of the Gospel, and are active, earnest and even enthusiastic—dare not yet positively say that they are justified before the Father in Jesus Christ the Saviour. If we have honestly, heartily, accepted Christ as our one and only Saviour, then we may know that we are accepted in Him. We have been delivered from the king-

dom of darkness, and are already the subjects of the kingdom of heaven. With my Canadian friend there was a *last* moment, a point of time, when he was under condemnation; and there was a *first* moment when, believing in Jesus, he stepped over the boundary line and became a new man, on whom thereafter "no condemnation" rested.

Doubtless there are many believers who cannot remember the exact date when they first trusted in Christ; nor is it essential to their salvation to know the day of the month or hour of the day when they believed. The important question now, which may be put in a personal form, is this: Have I accepted Christ? Have I come to Him? Has He saved me? To answer these questions in the affirmative is all important. God grant that each reader may be able to reply, "I am saved through the blood of the Lamb." The following answer to the question, "WHAT MUST I DO TO BE SAVED?" is both Scriptural and intelligent:

"Nothing either great or small,  
Nothing, sinner, do;  
Jesus died and did it all  
Long, long ago.

"When He from His lofty throne  
Stooped to do and die,  
Everything was fully done;  
Hearken to His cry.

"'It is finished,' yes indeed,  
Finished every jot:  
Sinner, THIS is all you need;  
Tell me, is it not?

"Till to Jesus' work you cling,  
By a simple faith;  
Doing is a deadly thing,  
Doing ends in death.

"Cast your deadly doing down,  
Down at Jesus' feet;  
Stand in Him, in Him alone,  
Gloriously complete."

---

**WAS THE APOSTLE PETER EVER AT ROME?**


---

BY REV. MASON GALLAGHER, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

**I**N the course of our examination of this question, we have seen that in the New Testament, and in the writings of early Christian authors, who lived in the first century after Peter's death, whose works have reached us, there is nothing to be found to show that this Apostle was ever in, or near Rome.

When the scheme and claims which rest upon the residence and episcopate of Peter in Rome, are considered, what has already been established would reasonably appear to be enough to decide the question against the Papacy.

In connection with the Scripture argument it remains, however, that we notice the controversy with respect to Babylon, where the Apostle wrote his First Epistle—c. v: 13.

Babylon, argue many writers, is Rome; for so the Apostle John designates the Imperial City in his Revelation; hence Peter wrote his Epistle there.

We have seen that Professor Ellendorf, a Roman Catholic, alludes to this view, but deems it not worthy of notice, remarking "The stale conversion of the name of Babylon into Rome (1 Peter v: 13) is the only argument by which they venture to prove Peter's abode at Rome, his episcopate and his Popedom; from the Holy Scriptures."

"It would not pay for the trouble to waste a word on it." (p. 608.) Simon in his work on the "Mission and Martyrdom of St. Peter," for the preparation of which work he spent nine months in the British Library in London, remarks on this point: "Father Calmet mentions several members of his church as having abandoned this

interpretation of the carnal-minded Jews. Some (Roman) Catholic writers," says he; "for instance, Peter de Marca, John Baptist Mantuan, Michael de Ceza, Marsile de Padua, John Aventin, John Leland, Charles du Moulin, and perhaps some others, have expressed their misgivings as to the truth of this interpretation." (Calmet's Com., Prelim. Diss., on 1 Peter.) But it is not misgivings that they express, it is unqualified denial, as any one may see by reference to their works. For instance:

"St. Peter went to Antioch," says Peter de Marca, Archbishop of Paris, a writer of extreme celebrity and favor in the Roman Church, "and from there to Babylon, where the hereditary Patriarch of the first dispersion of the Jews resided. When established in that city he wrote his First Epistle, as is clear from the words, 'the Church at Babylon salutes you.' For although the ancients supposed Peter to have here meant Rome, Scaliger can be shown to be right when he says that this letter was written from Babylon itself to those dispersed Jews whose provincial synagogues depended upon the Patriarch of Babylon." (De Marca de Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii, lib. vi., c. 1.) "It is not misgivings, then, that these writers have expressed." (Simon, p. 189, 190.)

Says Father Dupin: "The First Epistle was written from Babylon. Some of the ancients were of the opinion that Rome was meant by this name, but this would not be a natural interpretation. We cannot precisely assign the time it was written, but we may consider that it was written at Babylon

A. D. 45." (Prelim, Diss. sec. 4.)

The learned Hug in his Introduction, and Erasmus, both Roman Catholics, take the same view. "Why," says Erasmus, "is the Apostle here supposed to put Babylon enigmatically for Rome? Because idols were worshipped in Rome; that was done every where; that he might not reveal his own whereabouts. Whence this so great timidity in him?"

We might safely leave this question as settled by these eminent Roman authors in favor of the natural interpretation; but inasmuch as learned Protestants have held to the mystical interpretation, that Babylon means Rome; and to another view; it seems proper to further consider the subject.

The learned Dr. McKnight in his (Diss. sec. v. Pref. to St. Peter) writes: "Whitby, Grotius and all the learned of the Romish communion, are of opinion that by Babylon Peter figuratively meant *Rome*, called Babylon by John likewise. (Rev. xvii., xviii.) And their opinion is confirmed by the general testimony of Antiquity, which, as Lardner states, is of no small weight."

These are strong Protestant names, and to their side may be added those of Œcumenius, Bede, Hales, Cave, Hammond, Tomline, Milner, Wells, Buckley, Horne, Cook, Farrar, Ellicott, Renan, Seabury, Samson, Schaff, Fry, Doyle and Mant. Of Continental scholars Hoffman, Hengstenberg, Baur, Schott, Thiersch, Wiesenger, Windishman, Mynster, Semler, Hitzig, Godet, Valckn and Ewald, Est, Hilgenfield.

Another opinion has been held by some learned men that Babylon was an Egyptian city where Peter resided. Such was the opinion of Fulke, Pearson, Mill, Greswell, Leclerc, Calow,

Pott, Burton, Bertram, Wolf, Wall, Vitringa, Fabric and Trevor.

"This Babylon was a town of considerable importance near Heliopolis, mentioned by Strabo and Ptolemy. Josephus reports that the Jews afterwards built a temple there. We may thence conclude that they were already there in considerable numbers. And as Mark, who was generally in attendance on Peter, is supposed to have planted the Church of Alexandria, it is not improbable that Peter visited Egypt and may, therefore, have dated his First Epistle from Babylon near Heliopolis." This view gives increased interest to the Church of Alexandria.

Canon Trevor, in his work on "Rome," p. 62, regards this view favorably. He writes: "Peter was at this time probably at Babylon, the place from which his Epistle is dated; and though Eusebius with most of the Fathers in reference to the tradition, interpreted this word as a mystic name for Rome, this interpretation is now universally exploded. The visions of the Apocalypse which, however, had not then been revealed, do indeed call Rome by this name: with the date of a letter must, in all reason, be the actual name of the place. This was either the well known city on the Euphrates or, more probably, Babylon on the Nile. These were the two largest seats of Jewish population out of Palestine, and, therefore, as appropriate to Peter's mission as Rome, the capital of the world, was to St. Paul." He refers to his work on "Egypt," p. 115. Murray in his Hand-book of Egypt relates an interview with the Patriarch of Alexandria, in which the latter says, "there is no tradition in the Coptic Church that Peter ever visited Egypt."

The tradition that Peter wrote his First Epistle from Rome, styling it Babylon, appears to have originated from a misconception of the language of Eusebius the historian A. D. 340, with respect to Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, A. D. 110. Eusebius, referring to a statement that Mark's Gospel was written at the request of Peter's hearers, writes (ii: 15): "This story is given by Clement of Alexandria, and corroborated by Papias. There is, however, a report that it is this Mark that Peter mentions in his First Epistle, which it is also pretended was written at Rome, and that Peter intimates this himself by using the term 'Babylon' in a metaphorical sense for Rome." The translation is by Simon.

Cardinal Bellarmine, attributing this metaphorical use of Babylon to Papias, to whom it does not belong, places it at the head of his proofs for Peter's residence in Rome. This is his sole Scriptural authority for Peter's Roman residence. These are not the words of Papias, but a current rumor of the fourth century which Eusebius repeats.

Valesius, the Roman Catholic editor of Eusebius, writes: "These words are to be kept perfectly distinct from the preceding, as I find has been carefully done by Jerome and Nicephorus." (Lib. II. c. 15.) Father Dupin on this point remarks: "Some have thought that Papias and St. Clement of Alexandria cited in this chapter by Eusebius were of this opinion, but it is not on this point that Eusebius cited them."

Bouzique, the French jurist, writes: "According to Papias, John the Presbyter ascribed that Gospel to Mark, a disciple of Peter, but without saying it was put together Rome. (Eus. III: 39.)

Eusebius, reading this passage agreeably to the opinion of this time, inferred from it, as Clement from Alexandria, that the interpreter of Peter was then in Rome in company with the Apostle; while Papias says, solely with John the Presbyter, that Mark wrote the Gospel such as it was taught by Peter. Neither the Presbyter nor Papias, his disciple, speak of sojourn, or preaching in the Imperial City." (History of Christianity p. 364, 371.)

We therefore prefer to believe that the Apostle of the Circumcision traveled six hundred miles to Babylon, where Josephus says (*Antiqui xxxxi: 5*) the Jews in Peter's time were "infinite myriads, whose number it is not possible to calculate;" and with Philo, another contemporary, that they constituted "almost one-half the inhabitants." We see no good reason why he should travel two thousand miles to Rome, to preach to eight thousand of his countrymen, who were all sometimes banished by a single order. Lightfoot styles Babylon: "One of the greatest knots of Jews in the world."

Dr. Jarvis remarks (Church Review, 1: 166): "It is not certain, as Valesius and other critics of the Roman communion admit, that these were the words of Papias; and if so, we have only the testimony of the fourth century."

If the view is correct as taught by Auberlin and others, that the Apocalypse is a sequel to Daniel, the name Babylon was naturally used in the Revelation symbolically; but inasmuch as the Book was probably written at the close of the century, there is no good reason to believe that Peter ever saw it, or knew of such use; the contrary is most reasonable. Nor would the

dispersion have understood such an allusion, for we read in Lange: "According to Schottgen the Jews did not begin to call Rome Babylon till after the destruction of Jerusalem;" and this event occurred, according to Wiesler, more than six years after Peter's death. It is also to be noticed that John employs the term "Babylon the Great."

Kitto writes (Intr. to 1. Pet.): "The strongest argument against the Babylon of the Apostle being taken for Rome seems to be that urged by Professor Stuart in his note on Hug's Introduction—'That mystical Babylon,' i. e., Rome is meant, is still less probable. Mystical names of this kind in a prosaic epistle, consisting merely of plain and hortatory matter, are not to be expected, and cannot be admitted without strong reasons."

Arguing in the same line, Michaelis remarks: "The plain language of epistolary writing does not admit of figures of poetry; and though it would be very allowable in a poem written in honor of Gottingen, to style it another Athens, yet if a Professor of this University should in a letter from Gottingen date it Athens, it would be a greater piece of pedantry than was ever yet charged upon the learned."

Space does not allow us to dwell on the argument from the order of enumeration of the provinces, which read geographically from East to West, in the route a messenger from Babylon would take; nor from the fact that Silvanus (Silas) and Mark were not now with Paul at Rome (2 Tim. iv: 11), but with Peter; nor the authority of Cosmas Indicopleustes of the sixth century, who understood Babylon to be outside the Roman Empire. There is no Scripture for the Petrine claim, nor even

a tradition for two centuries. As with Babylon, so with Papias, this claim is unfounded. Papias must be ruled out.

The following authors hold that the Babylon of Peter was in Chaldea:

Calvin, Beza, Bengel, Beausobre, Basnage, Drusius, Gerhardus, Gomarus, Vorstius, Scaliger, Salmasius, Suicer, Schleusner, Dewette, Lipsius, Wiesler, Wettstein, Weiss, Kurtz, Steiger, Neander, Rosenmüller, Mayerhoff, Bleek, Ruetschi, Gavazzi, Fronmuller, Credner, Neudecker, Reuss, Huther, Kuhl, Bruckner, Winer, Presense.

Among English scholars: Whitaker, Willet, Bishop Andrews, Lightfoot, Poole, Mede, Bower, Cradock, Bishops Cumberland and Conybeare, M. Henry, Doddridge, Benson, Campbell, A. Clarke, Scott, Milman, Robbins, Dick, Hill, Edgar, Kitto, D. Brown, J. H. Brown, McGavin, Bloomfield, Simon, Greenwood, Angus, Alford, Littledale, Salmond, Kennion, Young, J. C. Gray, Johnstone, Hatch in Encl. Britt., Davidson, Blaikie, Cobbin, J. Brown of Haddington, J. Brown of Edinburg, Lillie, Maclear, McGuire, Faussett, Darby, Bentley, Bishops Thorold and Jones, Wesley, Wright, Oxford Teachers Bible, Cambridge Bible Com., Pulpit Com.

Of American writers of the same opinion we have: M. Stuart, Barnes, Barrows, Murdock, Bacon, Elliott, Crosby, Shimeall, Blackwood, Demarest, Fisher, Nourse, Harwood, Richardson, E. J. Smith, S. M. Jackson, T. V. Moore, C. P. Jones, C. M. Butler, J. G. Butler, Abbott and Conant, Pond, McClintock and Strong, C. Hodge, Justin Edwards, M. R. Vincent, Hackett, B. B. Edwards, Bomberger, Harman, Covell, Blackman, Taylor, Binney and Steele, Hague, Whedon.

---

FATHER O'CONNOR'S LETTERS TO CARDINAL GIBBONS.

---

## FOURTH SERIES.

NEW YORK, March, 1890.

SIR:—You and I were students in St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore; not at the same time, as you are many years my senior. You will therefore be interested in the following account of some very successful meetings that I held in a Methodist Church in that city last month. The report appeared in the leading daily paper of Baltimore, the *American*, February 14, 1890, as follows:

Bethany Methodist Church, corner of Lexington and Calhoun streets, was packed last night at the close of a series of revival meetings which have been conducted there by Rev. James A. O'Connor, of New York, formerly a priest of the Roman Catholic Church. Rev. Mr. O'Connor introduced to the congregation J. W. Holmes, a student of St. Mary's Catholic Seminary, on Paca street, who had left the seminary and the Roman Catholic Church and become a Protestant under Mr. O'Connor's guidance. He was there to give his experience as a Catholic, which he did, and undoubtedly created a sensation.

After the usual devotional exercises, Rev. Mr. O'Connor preached a short sermon. He spoke very kindly of the Catholics. Of the clergy, he said, he pitied them. He loved them as former associates, and with all his heart he said he wanted to see them brought into the light. During his career as an evangelical minister he said he had personal knowledge of twelve hundred Catholics being converted to the Protestant faith, and he knew that thousands, though not professing conversion, had had their faces turned toward Protestantism. In closing he alluded to the Catholic student, and introduced him to the congregation. In doing so he made a few remarks relating the circumstances attending Mr. Holmes' departure from the seminary.

"This brother," said Mr. O'Connor, "sought me out. We went to the study of the pastor of this church and began our conversation about the seminary, which I, too, had attended. We talked of the past, and then our talk drifted to Christ. We conversed for a while on this subject, speaking of the love and the all-saving power of our good God; and then, somehow—I can't tell how—I found myself on my knees beside our young brother, who also had fallen on his knees. Then we prayed, and the Holy Ghost descended and Christ entered our brother's heart. Peace and repose, hitherto unknown to him, entered his soul, and he is here to-night to tell you of Jesus and His love and his own experience."

As soon as Mr. O'Connor closed, the student stepped forward. He was robed in his student garb, consisting of a white collar, black tie and long gown. His face was cleanly shaven. He appears to be but little over twenty-one.

"I leave St. Mary's Seminary," said he, "because in there I cannot find peace. I sought aid from mortal man, but found none. I felt a longing for something which I could not even explain to myself. The ceremonies attending my stay at the seminary grew repulsive; everything seemed a sham. By chance I heard of Mr. O'Connor. I left the seminary and called on him. I found him at the parsonage of Bethany Church, as he has described. We talked of the seminary.

He asked certain things about the institution, and I answered his questions, and he remarked that there was very little change in the place. Then I told him about my spiritual troubles. He talked of Christ and explained the Scriptures as I had never heard them explained before. Finally we knelt in prayer, and while we prayed there stole into my heart a peace that was a stranger there. It was there that I resolved to leave the seminary, and so I have done it forever. There are others there who are groping in the dark that I wish I could lead to the light. For all connected with the seminary I maintain the most kindly feelings. Of all the students and priests I cannot help but think kindly, not to say lovingly. I wish they, like myself, were out of the wretched place, to cease following what I now am convinced is a false faith."

Mr. Holmes then said he had a paper which he wanted to read. 'He has sent it to St. Mary's Seminary. It explains his reasons for leaving. The paper, which he then read, was as follows:

ST. MARY'S SEMINARY, BALTIMORE, Feb. 12, 1890.

REV. FATHERS MAGNIEN AND DYER:

I am writing this that my departure from the seminary may be explained. As a man and as a Christian I must state my reasons for withdrawing. I had long believed that I had found Christ's true Church in the religion of Rome.

My knowledge of the practices of the Church had been derived wholly from the theological works of the doctors. Upon arriving here I learned very soon that the practical working of the Church is different from what I had supposed. I learned that the Virgin Mary alone is invoked, together with Joseph, and that our dear risen Saviour is not approached in prayer. Not one prayer have I heard addressed to Christ. Yet, are we not directed to do so?

"Habentes ergo pontificem magnum, qui penetravit cœlos, Jesum' Fillum Dei, teneamus confessionem. Non enim habemus pontificem qui non possit compati infirmitatibus nostris; tentatum autem per omnia pro similitudine absque peccato. Adeamus ergo cum fiducia ad thronum gratiæ, ut misericordiam consequamur, et gratiam inveniamus in auxilio opportuno." Heb. iv: 14-16.

Nowhere in the Bible are we directed to pray to the mother of Jesus, and I cannot longer continue to do so. She occupies, in the Roman Catholic Church, the place that God has given to his Son Jesus Christ. Christ alone is Mediator between the Father and man. "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous, and He is the proportion for our sins," etc. But here all are taught to go to Mary and gain her intercession with her Son. This is unfounded in Scripture, and is directly opposed to it. "Come unto Me [Jesus] all ye who labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take My yoke upon you, and learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For My yoke is easy and My burden is light." Matt. xi. In the seminary, however, everyone is told to have a "spiritual director" to guide him by advice and counsel. God says: "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him." Through our blessed risen Saviour we have access to God, who thus offers Himself as the "spiritual director" of

all men. "But," I am told, "you have no right to interpret Scripture for yourself." This is an invention of man inspired by Satan. God gave all men a free will, intelligence and a desire to arrive at truth. Chains may bind the limbs, may deprive the hands of their motion, but, thanks be to God, no chains can ever restrict the operation of the mind! I cannot and will not longer submit to be influenced by any inventions of man in religious matters.

Then, again, I fail to find the seminarians and the Roman Catholics generally filled with that love of Jesus that always characterizes the followers of Christ. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." And what also pained me is the total lack of study, not to say of interest, in God's holy Word, "If ye love Me, ye will keep My Commandments." But how can we know what His commandments are unless we study His Word? I will not state my views upon other matters just here. For every pupil, for every teacher, I entertain the greatest good will, as towards men; but, as towards the representatives of a religious system, as towards those who claim to set forth and teach God's truths, I have no sympathy whatever. I know there are many, many true, sincere Christians who bow at Rome's altars, but they are Christians not as a result of being Roman Catholics, but in spite of it. What would they not be were they permitted to exercise freely, accounting to no one but God, that most divine of all gifts, an unfettered intelligence? And the same is true of many of those who blindly follow the traditions and teachings of the Roman Church. I find not so great reverence for holy things in the seminary as among the Protestants. Therefore, since I am no longer at heart a Catholic, I wish to leave at once. I have prayed to God, and He has heard me. The hope and joy, peace and comfort I have been so long seeking have entered my heart and filled my soul.

I experienced this personal union with Christ, my Saviour, last Friday, as I knelt in prayer with one who had been formerly a Catholic priest, and was also educated in the seminary.

Permit me to say a few words more in parting: Study the most precious Word of God. Throw aside the explanations men have given it, and let the Holy Spirit alone be your guide in interpreting it. The childish traditions, legends and stories of past ages cast far away. Approach Jesus directly—not through the Virgin Mary—and surely He will hear, He will bless. I have not found one man here yet who knows anything about repentance and regeneration. Yet this is God's way. All must repent and turn from sin and bathe in the precious, cleansing blood of our dear Saviour. The Catholic Church is an exponent of what I verily believe is largely unfounded traditions and fables. I bear it no love. It has miserably deceived me—has injured me. Hence forth I shall take the blessed Bible for my guide, and study it with the assured promise of the aid of God in understanding its sweet truths. And, in conclusion, let me say, I love the dear men here. All have been kind. May the true light from heaven enter their hearts, fill their souls with peace, and lead them to Jesus!

J. W. HOLMES.

You must watch your students more closely, Cardinal, or I will bring more of them into the light and liberty of the Gospel. JAMES A. O'CONNOR.

**"FATHER FLYNN."**

We are happy to announce that Mr. Needham's choice little book, "Father Flynn," is now ready for delivery. Many friends have already sent in their orders, but as we have reduced the price to 30 cents, we expect many will order two or more copies for distribution among priests and people. The book is published in fine style, paper cover, 30 cents, handsomely bound in cloth 50 cents. We will send 12 copies, paper covers, for \$3.00, bound in cloth \$5.00.

**Miss Cusack's New Book.**

The Nun of Kenmare's new book, "Life Inside the Church of Rome," is now ready. The price has been increased to \$1.75. Her sharp criticism of Roman Catholic bishops and priests in the United States gave rise to some apprehension that they would sue the American publisher of the work for libel. Now, as the book has appeared, they will have an opportunity to vindicate themselves and refute the charges she brings against them. But they will not do so. It may be expected, however, that they will abuse her to their hearts' content. But she, like the rest of us, will get accustomed to that.

The London *English Churchman* says of this work:

"Miss Cusack has a great deal to reveal, and she speaks with no hesitating sound. . . . The book before us is something more than a revelation to the Protestant world; it is also a controversial treatise in popular form in which the doctrinal errors of the Papacy are considered from the highest standpoint—the written Word of God. It is a book which should find a place on every Protestant family's bookshelf.

**BOUND VOLUMES OF THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC.**

The bound volumes of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC are a treasury of information, reliable and accurate, on all questions relating to the Roman Catholic Church. Vols. II., III., IV., V. and VI., handsomely bound in cloth, will be sent to any address for \$6.00, when ordered together.

...

**"THE SPIRITUAL MAN."**

This stirring pamphlet contains the address which Evangelist Geo. C. Needham delivered before the Bible Convention at Northfield, Mass., and which called out warm endorsement. The subject treated is one of paramount importance in these days. Mr. Needham shows the true antidote to carnality of heart and life, and also points out the way to true spirituality and holy living. We will send this helpful book to any address for 10 cents.

**CONVERTED CATHOLIC TRACTS.**

"Sketch of Father O'Connor's Life and Work;" 32 pages.

"Portrait of Mary in Heaven, drawn from Holy Scripture;" 32 pages.

"Difficulties of Roman Catholic Priests;" 16 pages.

"The Crucified Jesus and the Penitent Thief," by Father Chiniquy; 22 pages.

"What Attitude should Protestant Ministers Maintain towards Roman Catholicism?" An address delivered before the Ministerial Union of Baltimore by Rev. James A. O'Connor, December 30, 1889; 24 pages.

These are excellent tracts for distribution. We will send a package of 10 of each for 50 cents, or 25 of each for \$1.00. Address all orders to this office.

**CHRIST'S MISSION.**

Many friends have expressed their regret that the Reformed Catholic services could not be held in Masonic Temple, New York, this year as usual. As already explained the trustees of the Temple rented it to ex-Reverend and irreverent Hugh O. Pentecost, who said in a recent Sunday evening lecture in the Temple, "I think it is not a good thing for people to believe in God. I think it is a bad thing for them to do so. . . . I want the idea of God entirely rooted out of the mind. . . . I want to see the Christian Church utterly destroyed." Mr. Pentecost obtained money from the people of New York to pay fifty per cent. more rent for Masonic Temple than could be paid by the converted Catholics who preach Christ Jesus as the only hope of the world, the blessed Son of God who came into the world to save sinners. In this case the Gospel of Christ had to retire before Atheism. Money did it; also some Tammany Hall politics. An effort was made to rent a church building on Twenty-third street that is vacant, but though \$100 a month was offered for it, the trustees wanted \$2,000 a year. The church is still vacant.

If \$10,000 be received during the next six months a building will be purchased where all the departments of the work for the conversion of Roman Catholics can be united. There is now in the hands of the treasurer \$4,000. Among the contributions that came recently was a check for \$100—"a thank-offering for deliverance from the power of rum, Romanism and insanity, the three gigantic evils of Massachusetts." Another check was for \$500, another for \$50,

and several smaller sums. The small offerings are as welcome as the larger ones, but they will not secure the building so quickly. There should be a home to which converted priests and students like Mr. J. W. Holmes could be invited.

**KIND WORDS.**

From the Minneapolis *Northwestern Presbyterian*, February 8, 1890:

An especially good word is due THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, a monthly magazine designed for the enlightenment of Roman Catholics and their conversion to evangelical Christianity. The January number presents a portrait of Rev. Thomas Connellan, the converted Irish priest, with whose romantic escape from the Roman Church many are familiar. Father O'Connor's editorial notes are strong and pointed and the entire contents of the number are of the same quality.

\* \*

From the Chicago *Advance*, February 14, 1890:

Volume VI. of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC for the year 1889 contains a large amount of information which will be welcome to those interested in the revolt among the Catholics themselves against the rule of Rome. It is edited by Rev. James A. O'Connor, a converted Catholic priest, and is especially full in regard to the important work which he is conducting among the Roman Catholics in New York City and throughout the country. James A. O'Connor, Publisher, 72 Bible House, New York. \$1.00 a year; bound volume \$1.50.

\* \*

From the Dublin *Christian Irishman*, February, 1890:

We noticed some of the monthly numbers of this spirited publication as they appeared during the year. They are now presented in a neat volume (Vol. VI.). Father O'Connor does not deal in minced words; but while vehemently denouncing the evils of the Roman Church, he uniformly writes in a spirit of the greatest sympathy towards his former co-religionists. Judging from THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC there must be a great ferment in the Roman Catholic Church in America